

□ 1530

And, yes, Mr. Leader, with you on some very issues of great importance to this institution. And I continue to be in that posture, but, yes, we do see it differently. The leader got, at 10 p.m. last night, the opportunity to review this in a meaningful way.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly when I got it, too.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this was of great import. Every speaker that came to the floor expressed outrage, expressed deep concern about what this had done and the impact it would have on America and our image abroad but, more importantly than our image, on our ability to continue to lead on issues of freedom and justice and human rights throughout the world. At 10 p.m., whether it was same time he got it or not, I would suggest to the leader is not a time frame in which we can thoughtfully try to reach a bipartisan agreement.

We do not expect nor do we ask for you to accept without question our position or our changes. But we do expect to have the opportunity to discuss them. I did not have an opportunity to discuss it with you, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), or the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). I saw the resolution at 9 a.m. this morning. I had no ability to put input nor did others. And the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), I think, is on the floor and I would be glad to yield to him if he would want to make a comment.

If not, in my discussions with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), he believes there was not the full opportunity that he would have liked to have considered in a bipartisan fashion. And that committee, as you well know, and that gentleman from Missouri has been one of the most bipartisan Members of the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand that because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) wrote the draft. It was done by late yesterday afternoon. It was sent to the legislative counsel. The entire draft was done, their agreed-to draft, both the Democrat ranking member, Republican chairman putting together a draft, coming together, and having done that, then it was vetted with the leadership. How much time does one need?

After they finish writing the draft, do they sit around and wait? For what? The two gentlemen that were charged with writing the resolution came together, wrote a resolution that they both put their name on and had agreed to; then it was given to the leadership

staff and the leaders, and then that is when the leader wanted to eliminate two clauses and insert another clause. We agreed to eliminate the two clauses. We did not agree to insert the third clause, and that is when negotiation and bipartisanship, which, by the way, that only 50 voted against the resolution, broke down.

Evidently 365 Members thought it was a very well-crafted bipartisan effort.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have been in a position where I was one of four voting against something if I thought it was appropriate to do. So he can keep saying there were only 50 as long he wants. There should have been zero. His side believes that and our side believes that. Our side is as deeply committed to supporting the troops as is his side. That is good news of this day. Everyone has expressed that.

It does not serve our purposes further, related to staff here, they did not get a draft from their perspective until after 6 p.m. last night when, as you know, we had adjourned. I was at the Fire Service Caucus with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), with whom I work in lockstep, and have for 13 to 14 years in a bipartisan way. We understand bipartisanship. We have a Fire Service bill on this floor totally bipartisan.

So I understand bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker. It does not serve our purpose to further discuss procedures. I agree on that. We have a different view. But what it does serve our purposes for is trying to come together not in a way that will divide the House, but in a way that will bring the House together. That, I believe, is the best interest of our country. I would hope we could do that, and I will work with the gentleman to accomplish that objective, and I presume he will work with me as well.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to work with the gentleman because the gentleman has shown good faith in trying to work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 10, 2004, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 11, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, May 10, 2004; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 627, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President's Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Thompson, who has previously said he will not allow the reimportation of less expensive FDA-approved drugs from Canada or any other country, deeming them unsafe, of course his assistant secretary, Mr. Hubbard, when questioned before a congressional committee, could not document one single instance of safety problems with Canadian drugs, yet can document thousands of problems with the supply chain here in the United States because of a virtually uncontrolled wholesale drug market.

So it really is not the issue of safety. It is the issue of the profitability of the pharmaceutical industry. They make their profits all in the United States, and that allows them to sell drugs very cheaply in other countries, and they say that is necessary to protect their investment in new technologies and new drugs.

I certainly want to see new drugs and new technologies developed, but why should Americans only pay for those investments? And that is the system they are attempting to perpetuate, and there is also of course the issue that it is only recently that the pharmaceutical industry has been allowed to advertise on television and now they are spending upwards of 6, \$7 billion a year on promotion, which of course drives up the cost of drugs, and I am

not quite sure of the value what the little purple pill ads or many of those other ads on television are, and I think consumers would be happy to consult with their doctors rather than 30-second ads if they could see the price of their drugs go down. Drugs are going up at about 10 times the current rate of inflation on an annual basis. They are simply not affordable for most Americans.

So yesterday Secretary Thompson announced that the Maginot Line that this administration has created to defend the profits of the pharmaceutical industry, the Maginot Line that said this was an issue of safety, Americans should not be allowed to reimport lifesaving drugs at a fraction of the cost, that they are available in this country, he predicted it will crumble. He predicted that we will see the reimportation of drugs.

Why is that? What happened to his safety concerns? I think the safety concern that has been elevated in their minds right now is the reelection of George Bush who read the polls. Eighty-five percent of the people cannot understand how it is free trade when we export American jobs, but there is no free trade issue when we prohibit the importation of less expensive pharmaceuticals from Canada, our neighbor, that our FDA approved.

And then today in a further indication that their Maginot Line, their protection of this industry, is crumbling quickly, we have two major drug chains, CVS and Walgreens, who have both come out in favor of reimportation. They do not want to see individuals reimporting. They want to protect their businesses. They want to see that they and other wholesale purchasers can go to Canada where it they can purchase drugs more cheaply from a Canadian wholesaler by far than they can purchase them directly from a pharmaceutical company here in the United States. As big as they are, as much as they buy, the price they are charged is significantly higher than the price at which these drugs are sold in Canada.

So the bottom line here is we have people in this country suffering. They cannot afford the drugs they need. Seniors in my district dividing pills in half, couples sitting down at beginning of the month and deciding who will get their pills this month and who will not, despite their jeopardy to their health, and the Bush administration says they are worried about the health and safety of Oregonians or the American public. Their health and safety is definably hurt by the fact they cannot afford lifesaving drugs. And since they cannot document a single instance of problems from Canada, then let us allow Americans to reimport drugs from Canada, and I would be happy if they could do that through their pharmacies because pharmacies are a key part of this chain and consumer information.

The other thing we could do, and of course the Bush administration is ada-

manly opposed to but who knows, maybe they will change there too, is negotiate lower drug prices on behalf of the American people like every other civilized democracy on earth does for all their citizens. There is no other country on earth that allows the pharmaceutical industry to leverage these extraordinary extortionate prices for lifesaving drugs out of their citizens. Only the Government of the United States. But, amazingly, the Bush administration got a clause inserted in the so-called Medicare prescription drug benefit that prohibits the government from negotiating lower drug prices, prohibits the government from negotiating, not mandating, negotiating lower drug prices; unlike every other civilized democracy on earth; unlike the private insurance industry which can and does negotiate discounts; unlike the Veterans Administration, which can and does and gets a good deal for our vets, negotiates discounts; and unlike what we mandate in Medicaid.

But they are saying, no, we cannot do that elsewhere. There would be too much market power, meaning it would bring down the price too much. And then what will happen to the industry? The industry will then have to drive a little tougher deal with all these other countries. Instead of just saying, Oh, they will not pay, you will have to pay, everybody would share the cost of the development of new drugs and Americans could have access at lower prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week enrollment began for the prescription drug discount cards available for the Medicare bill passed last year. For some seniors in my home State of Ohio, this could mean \$600 in prescription drug benefits. That sounds great. We want seniors to look into these cards. If they can get help, that is obviously a good thing.

However, the real story about these cards is found in the details. The discount drug cards will further complicate an altogether too confusing process for America's seniors. Instead of implementing a prescription drug benefit under one program, Medicare, which serves 39 million American beneficiaries, the administration fought to create an unnecessarily complex system that diverts money away from

benefits and gives it to drug companies and the insurance companies. The drug companies under this legislation, this new law, according to bipartisan studies, will profit \$150 billion more than they are already making, and at the same time, this bill gives a \$46 billion subsidy, a \$46 billion direct subsidy, taxpayer dollars, to the Nation's insurance industry.

□ 1545

That is not any real surprise, considering that President Bush's reelection campaign has received tens of millions of dollars from the drug industry and tens of millions of dollars from the insurance industry.

But this new program will feature 70 cards, 70 choices of private insurance prescription drug cards, by 70 different companies. It is a lot like the multiple HMO system our Republican friends are trying to foist on Medicare beneficiaries.

So here is the deal. Beginning this week, seniors will get notices at their houses. They will get visits, in Ohio, from up to 50 insurance agents, they will get mailings from up to 50 companies, and then they will get to choose these cards.

Now, what we could have is one Medicare card where seniors get a discount negotiated by the government, the way they do it in every other country in the world, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) said, one card with prices negotiated by the government on behalf of 40 million beneficiaries. But the Bush administration way, in part because one of his best friends and biggest contributors owns one of these card companies, but let us get back to this, the Bush administration is going to give you a choice of 50 cards.

Now, you buy one of these cards. Pick this card. This card perhaps might have a 30 percent discount or a 20 percent discount on Fosamax. This card here might have a 15 percent discount on Zoloft, or this card here might have a 12 percent discount on Celebrex.

Then you choose this card. You can only choose one card. You pay \$30 for this card that you get to choose, one of these 50 cards, as these insurance agents come to your home and these mailings come to your home and these fancy brochures come to your home. You choose one card; you pay \$30. And then this card company can actually change what drugs are covered by this card any week during those 52 weeks, during that year, or it can change the percent discount.

So you get this card, this one right here, because it has got a pretty good discount for Fosamax and Vioxx and Zoloft, three drugs you are taking, it has a 15 percent discount. But then after you pay the \$30, three weeks from now the card company can say, well, we are not going to cover Vioxx anymore, we are going to cover Celebrex, and we are not going to give you a 20 percent discount on Fosamax, we are